



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

brought out at the end of the chapter. Such a contribution as this reveals, as scarcely anything else could, the manifold advantages of having each section of such a history as this executed by a specialist, rather than by an industrious person of some general literary equipment and fluency in writing.

Mr. Waller himself utters the valedictory to the Middle Ages in Chapter XVIII. It makes the impression of being somewhat repetitive; we are reintroduced to Anglo-Norman chronicles and histories, the political verse is treated briefly, and lyrics and carols, which Professor Padelford had discussed, are again brought up. The summary of the literary significance of the fifteenth century does not agree with that given earlier in the volume by Professor Saintsbury. The quotation of "the demesnes that here adjacent lie" (not quite accurately cited) as representing "the stately pleasure-houses of Chaucer and the Elizabethans" is less effective if one remembers the context of the original. Advantage has been taken of some extra space to insert in the bibliography to this closing chapter considerable miscellaneous information for which no place could elsewhere be found. These elaborate bibliographies are a most valuable feature of this series, affording a convenient and detailed summary of criticism up to date.

On reviewing these two volumes once more, one realizes, with gratitude to the editors for their difficult and wearisome task, that nowhere else is there such a complete and scholarly treatment of literature in England in the Middle Ages, and of the contributory facts which shaped and developed that literature.

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE.

Columbia University, March, 1909.

THE VALIANT WELSHMAN, by R. A. Gent. Nach dem Drucke von 1615 herausgegeben von Dr. Valentin Kreb. (*Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie*, hrsg. von Breymann und Schick. Heft 23) Erlangen & Leipzig, 1902. Pp. lxxvii+88.

The Valiant Welshman is an interesting play; not because of intrinsic merit, but because it gives one the pleasure of recognition and identification. The faces of old friends are continually in evidence. Besides specific reminiscences of Shakespeare, Jonson, Kyd, and Spenser, the whole play is a conglomeration of conventional scenes and stage-business. The author must have written out of a familiarity of many years with the Elizabethan stage. Nothing seems original, but rather is it a *mélange* of all

that was popular on the stage of the time. Perhaps it was this reminiscential interest which led Dr. Krebs to devote over four pages to the 'Ästhetischer Wert' of a play which after all conforms to the characterization disapprovingly quoted by Dr. Krebs from E. Meyer, 'a wretched tragedy.' This section should have been omitted, and the rest of the sixty-five pages of introduction condensed. It is too diffuse. On the other hand the glossary of one page, and the notes of ten might well have been extended.

After a bibliography of four pages, and a brief account of the early editions and the present text, the introduction considers the language (principally the Welsh dialect of Morgan, beside that of Shakespeare's Sir Hugh Evans and Fluellen, and of Sir Owen in *Patient Grissell*) and the metre. Stories of Caradoc in romance and folk-lore are mentioned, and discussion is given of Mason's *Caractacus* and Beaumont and Fletcher's *Bonduca*, in which Caratach (*Caractacus*) is a leading character. The extent to which the story has entered into English literature is rather fully shown.

Holinshed's *Chronicles* and Tacitus are the chief sources of the historical part of the story. Some events of the play do not appear in either. Krebs does not consider the suggestion made by Schelling (*Eng. Chron. Play*, p. 189) that this play perhaps drew directly on original Welsh sources.¹ As 'Literarische Quellen' are assigned: for Caradoc's adventure with the monster, Spenser's *Faerie Queene* 3. 7; for the attempt of Marcus Gallicus on Voadia, Shakespeare's *Rape of Lucrece*; for the dumb show and the jesting inquest over Gloster's body, *Hamlet*; for the foolish Morion's love to the fairy queen, the fleecing of Dapper by similar means in Jonson's *Alchemist*; and for one or two minor details, *The Spanish Tragedy*. None of these but the *Lucrece* reference are anything more than reminiscences, and I doubt if there is even a reminiscence of Spenser. Some version of the long-standing association of Caradoc with a serpent is more likely to have suggested the episode. The Gallicus-Voadia episode is like enough to Shakespeare's *Lucrece* to be a direct imitation, and certain verbal correspondences are adduced. Its relation to the versions of the story in Chaucer, Lydgate, Painter, Heywood, and others should be considered.

The Valiant Welshman was printed in 1615, and because of the likeness of one scene to a scene in Jonson's *Alchemist*, Krebs thinks it must have been written not earlier than that play (1610). However this proves nothing, for Jonson is as likely to have taken the idea from *The Valiant Welshman* as *vice versa*. A more valid reason for not identifying it with the plays men-

¹ In Schelling's *Eliz. Drama*, 1908, he goes farther, saying "from sources clearly Celtic." (1.295.)

tioned by Henslowe in 1595 and 1598, and for dating its composition much later, is the reference in the address 'To the In-genuous Reader' to the number of chronicle plays already played, and its attempt to embody in one play every device used in plays of 1600-1610. Only a probability is established as to the date. Schelling (*op. cit.*, 179) thinks its structure and style point to the 'height of the Chronicle Drama,' i. e. not later than 1606. Greg (*Henslowe's Diary*, Pt. II, p. 178) holds that all its allusions 'point to a date about 1610, and there is no trace of the survival of older work.'

Yet more insoluble than the date is the authorship. The claims of Robert Armin, the only name suggested, are decisively rejected, and with good reason.² About all that can be said is that the author had a thoro knowledge of the classics, and was intimately acquainted with the London stage for some years, and was of the rank of gentleman—unless, in the absence of any facts, we hazard the conjecture that 'Gent.' of the title-page refers to some one of the family of Gent. Sir Thomas Gent, who died 1593, studied at Cambridge, and had seven sons, of whom were Edward—perhaps the same as Edward Gent, Fellow of Corpus Christi 1597 and University Proctor 1605—and Roger, who would furnish the initial *R*. The family is an old one, which I believe still survives (cf. T. Wright, *Hist. & Topog. of Essex*). Doubtless it is wholly a coincidence that there is a play, *The Valiant Scot*, 1637, by 'J. W. Gent.'

Just why the glossary exists is hard to say. It should have been either incorporated in the notes or else made a full register of all words needing definition. No line of demarcation between notes and glossary seems to have been drawn. 'Battalions,' 1. 1. 71=battles, a use not recorded by N. E. D., is not mentioned in either. Again we do not need to be told that 'sacke=sack, erstürmen.' 'Aboue all cry,' 2. 1. 42 (glossary) is not 'gewiss (?)', but means ('beyond the telling.') Notes 2. 1. 41-2, 'such a many lights in their heeles, and lungs in their hands' refers to the light dancing shoes of the maskers (as 'shee shittle-cocks' of l. 39 suggests light-footed dancers) and the harps in their hands, a punning reference to lights in the sense of lungs also being intended. Dr. Kreb is less happy in explanation of slang, jokes, and word-plays of this sort than in other things. A full and rigorously constructed glossary would be valuable, as would the inclusion of more explanatory matter in the notes. The index records only matters explained in notes and glossary. It should cover the introduction, and if the glossary were adequate, not index that. As it is, the glossary is but a sort of extract from

² Schelling, perhaps inadvertently, repeats, without giving any grounds, the old ascription to Armin (*Eliz. Dram.* 1.295).

or appendage to the notes, and so needs to be indexed with the notes. Convenience would have been served by the insertion of act and scene numbers at the tops of the pages. An attempt also should have been made to establish the places where the action occurs. Dr. Kreh refers to, but does not explicitly correct, an erroneous statement of Ward (*Eng. Dram. Lit.*, 1. 436): "The only play by Armin which has been preserved, viz., the "Chronicle History" of *The Valiant Welshman*." The *Two Maids of More-clack* (i. e., Mortlake), 1609, is undisputedly by Armin.

Reprints of this sort, however, must stand or fall largely by the accuracy of their texts. This I have not had an opportunity of testing by comparison with the edition of 1615, or that of 1663. The edition of 1663 differs from that of 1615 only in corruption of text, and therefore the text follows 1615 with all peculiarities of spelling and punctuation, except for the correction of obvious misprints. In the few cases where 1615 and 1663 differ in sense the editor has exercised his judgment, and given us the rejected reading in the footnotes. Variants of 1663 are further noted to illustrate the condition of that text. Dr. Kreh's corrections of the text are judicious. They are largely restorations of the metre. He does not consider the possibility of variants between copies of the same edition.

So far as I can see, the text is carefully and intelligently treated, and gives a faithful copy of 1615, barring errors in transcription, which I have no means of detecting. On the whole the edition seems intelligently done, and worthy of credit.

CHARLES M. HATHAWAY, JR.

United States Naval Academy.

CHAUCER, A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL MANUAL. By Eleanor Prescott Hammond, Ph. D. Pp. X+579. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1908.

Of the three prime desiderata for the further advancement of Chaucerian scholarship the first, a critical text with full apparatus, is still discouragingly remote; the second, a concordance to Chaucer, is well under way (although one could wish that the critical text had been established first); the third, a working bibliography, is now happily in our hands. And among the books in the field that are avowedly tools, few more important contributions than Dr. Hammond's have been made.

It may be well to note at once that Miss Hammond's book is called explicitly a *Bibliographical Manual*—not a *Bibliography*;